

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated April 3, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on July 3, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-47 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 7-25 and 28-47 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 2, 7, 11, 19-25 and 28-47 have been amended. Claims 5, 6, 26 and 27 have been cancelled. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 22-42 are rejected as encompassing wireless communications, which the Examiner believes is nonstatutory subject matter. Applicants have amended the claims to recite a computer readable storage medium, thereby excluding any wireless applications. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn. Claims 43-47 are rejected as failing to recite hardware. The claims have been amended to recite hardware. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-47 are rejected on the basis that “generating” can be understood to mean “formulating” which the Examiner asserts is abstract manipulation, and therefore not statutory. Applicants have amended the claims to clarify that the generating steps are performed under the operation of a computer processor and are, therefore, not abstract manipulations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 43-47 are rejected as failing to recite an essential element which the Examiner asserts is “enabling hardware”. Claims 1-47 are rejected on the basis that “generating” can be understood to mean “formulating” which the Examiner asserts

amounts to an omission of an essential element. These rejections are obviated by the amendments made with respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8, 11-16, 19-29, 32-37, 40-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Cox et al.* (US Patent No. 2002/0156806) (hereinafter “Cox”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Regarding claims 1, 11, 22, 32, 42, 43, 46, 47:

In this case, Cox does not disclose “each and every element as set forth in the claim”. For example, Cox does not disclose the limitation, as recited in amended claim 1, of “selecting a subset of . . . transformation rules in accordance with a requested graphical representation type”. Claims 22 and 43 recite a similar limitation as amended claim 1. Cox also does not disclose the limitation, as recited in claim 11, of “providing transformation rules . . . describing graphical attributes of the requested graphical representation type”. Claims 21, 32, 42, 46, and 47 recite a similar limitation as claim 11. The Examiner argues that Cox discloses selecting transformation rules for transforming an abstract data structure into a concrete data structure at Cox page 5, paragraph 44. However, the cited passage is in fact directed to allowing an author to control the ways in which a reader can manipulate a live document.

In the cited section, Cox is disclosing a method where the author can choose “actions” that a reader of a live document may want to employ in order to manipulate a visualization, thus enabling the reader to better analyze the data being displayed. This

method is only concerned with giving the author the ability to control what manipulations the reader can employ on a given visualization and is not providing or selecting transformation rules that transform an abstract data structure into a concrete data structure. The operations involved only enable or disable certain functions or limit what data the reader can manipulate. They are not involving the process of transforming an object from one form to another. Thus, at the cited section, there is no transformation process and thereby no need for transformation rules as disclosed in the present Application.

Similarly, Cox fails to disclose the step, as recited in amended claim 1, of “generating, on the basis of the abstract data structure and a selected subset of transformation rules, a concrete data structure defining a concrete graphical representation of the data in a graphics rendering language”. Claims 22 and 43 recite a similar limitation as amended claim 1. Cox also does not disclose the limitation, as recited in claim 11, of “generating, on the basis of an abstract data structure, a concrete data structure defining a concrete graphical representation in a graphics rendering language using the transformation rules”. Claims 21, 32, 42, 46, and 47 recite a similar limitation as claim 11. The Examiner argues that Cox discloses, at Figure 8 and corresponding description, generating, on the basis of the abstract data structure, a concrete data structure defining a concrete graphical representation in a graphics rendering language using the transformation rules. However, the cited section is in fact directed to describing a live document that a reader would view and ways a reader could manipulate the document. The cited section does not disclose any information about using a transformation rule to generate a concrete data structure based on an abstract data structure. Additionally, as described above, in the sections the Examiner pointed to, Cox does not disclose the selecting or providing of transformation rules that could be used for this generation process.

Accordingly, for all the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that Cox does disclose a method, computer-readable storage medium, or computer that includes all the limitations recited by claims 1, 11, 22, 32, 42, 43, and 47, and therefore, respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 2-4, 7-10, 12-18, 23-25, 28-30, and 33-39:

Claims 2-4, 7-10, 12-18, 23-25, 28-30, and 33-39 each ultimately depend from one of claims 1, 11, 22 or 32. As Applicant believes the above remarks demonstrate that the base claims are allowable, Applicant believes that the respective dependent claims are also allowable, and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 19, 40, 41, 44, and 45:

Cox does not disclose the limitation of amended claim 19 which recites “transforming the abstract data structure into a plurality of concrete data structures, each concrete data structure corresponding to a different graphics rendering language”. Claims 40, 41, 44, and 45 recite a similar limitation as amended claim 19. The Examiner repeatedly and only points to Cox at Figure 8 and corresponding description, as disclosing the generation of a concrete data structure which the Examiner correlates to the concrete data structures described in the present Application. However, as described above, that section of Cox does not disclose a transformation process and furthermore, does not disclose a transformation from an abstract data structure into a plurality of concrete data structures. Additionally, the Examiner cites Cox at page 7, paragraph 72 as disclosing the selecting of an abstract data structure template. That cited section discloses a method where the result is an applet which displays a graphical representation. There is no disclosure of a plurality of graphical representations being displayed from one abstract data structure. Moreover, there is no disclosure of concrete data structures corresponding to different graphics rendering languages.

Accordingly, for all the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Cox does disclose all the limitations recited by claims 19, 40, 41, and 45, and therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9, 10, 17, 18, 30, 31, 38, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox.

Each of these claims ultimately depend from one of base claims 1, 11, or 32. As Applicant believes the above remarks demonstrate that the base claims 1, 11, and 32 are allowable, Applicant believes that the respective dependent claims are also allowable, and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)